Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 remain pending.

In the Office Action dated September 21, 2007, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Kinnunen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,501). **Although claims 11-20 are also pending in the application, those claims do not appear to have been examined by the Examiner. Thus, applicants respectfully request examination of those claims.** Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse the rejection provided herein to any extent deemed applicable to the amended claims.

With the above amendments, applicants are further clarifying one or more aspects of their environment. These amendments are being provided in a bona fide attempt to further prosecution of this application and not in acquiescence to the rejection. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification including, for instance, paragraphs 19, 21 and 29. Thus, no new matter is added.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, a capability is provided within a communications environment for restricting access by client nodes of the environment to particular resources of a server node of the environment. Information provided at the server node over a communications medium via a trusted agent is used to determine which resources of the server node are accessible by one or more clients. In one example, these resources are physical resources, such as I/O devices of the communications environment. That is, in applicants' environment, physical resources of a server node are shared between a plurality of client nodes. The client node uses information provided by a trusted agent to determine the physical resources assigned to that client node.

In one particular aspect, applicants claim a method of determining resources accessible to client nodes (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, receiving information at a server node via a communications medium, the communications medium usable in accessing data at the server node, the server node including a plurality of physical resources to be shared by a plurality of clients coupled to the server node; and using

the information to determine one or more physical resources of the plurality of physical resources of the server node assigned to a given client node of the plurality of client nodes, wherein the client node is restricted access to the one or more determined physical resources such that one or more other physical resources of the plurality of physical resources is inaccessible to the client node. Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, a server node includes a plurality of physical resources that are to be shared by a plurality of clients coupled to the server node. Information received at the server node (e.g., an access table) is used to determine the one or more physical resources of the server node assigned to a given client node. The client node has restricted access to those one or more determined physical resources, such that one or more other physical resources of the server node are inaccessible to the client node. This is not described, taught or suggested in Kinnunen.

In contrast to applicants' claimed invention, Kinnunen describes a system for providing location dependent services to a plurality of mobile terminals within a coverage area. Various services may be provided, but the services available to a mobile entity are dependent on location of the mobile entity. As the mobile entity moves around, the services may change. Thus, Kinnunen is concerned with which services can be provided at particular locations, and is not at all concerned with the sharing of physical resources of a server or of determining which physical resources of a server are assigned to a client node of that server, as claimed by applicants.

For instance, Kinnunen makes no mention of sharing of physical resources, and in particular, does not describe, teach or suggest at least applicants' claimed feature of determining which physical resources of a plurality of resources of a server are available to a client. This is missing from Kinnunen. Instead, Kinnunen describes which services are available to mobile entities based on the location of the entities. There is no description of the sharing of physical resources. There is no description of determining which physical resources of a server are assigned to a particular client node. Applicants' environment and problems associated therewith are very different from that of Kinnunen.

Since applicants' claimed invention is concerned with an environment which is not addressed by Kinnunen and since Kinnunen fails to describe, teach or suggest one or more

aspects of applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that Kinnunen does not anticipate nor render obvious applicants' claimed invention.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and the other independent claims, are patentable over Kinnunen. Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features.

For example, dependent claim 4 recites that the determining by the server node whether the information was received via a trusted agent includes determining whether a manager key that is included within the received information is valid, and wherein the storing of the information includes storing an access data structure having an indication of physical resources assigned to particular nodes, in response to the determining indicating that the manager key is valid. This processing is not described, taught or suggested in Kinnunen. For example, in Kinnunen, information is provided from a mobile terminal to the network, and not from a management node having a manager key, as claimed by applicants. Further, there is no discussion in Kinnunen of the particular processing described in dependent claim 4. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 4 and other similar dependent claims are patentable over Kinnunen.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowability for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller

Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: January 21, 2008
HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579